

Anna Aksenova 

University at Buffalo (SUNY), Buffalo, United States
sozercanie@inbox.ru

The Reconstruction of Metaphorical Mapping as an Instrument of the Pre-translation Analysis of Poetry

Abstract

Although it can help avoid far too literal translations of metaphorical expressions, the reconstruction of metaphorical mapping is still an unclaimed instrument of pre-translation analysis. This research aims at a pre-translation analysis of a book of poems, *Babylon in a Jar* (1998) by Andrew Hudgins, which has not been previously translated into Russian. The method for linguistic metaphor identification created by G. Steen is applied for the first time in this study as an instrument of pre-translation analysis. Firstly, key conceptual metaphors of the book are identified: *death is departure*, *life is a journey*, *plants are people*, and *emotional intimacy is physical closeness*. Secondly, the relationship between source and target domains is analysed. For example, the source domain for the metaphor *people are plants* is a daffodil, a tree, or a chinaberry. In Western cultures, a chinaberry symbolizes the tree of knowledge and in A. Hudgins' poem, this idea is mapped onto knowledge about sinful human nature. Thirdly, translation strategies are outlined. In the translated version, another plant is introduced to preserve the original cross-domain mapping because the chinaberry tree is not familiar to Russian readers. Based on conceptual metaphor theory, this research seeks to integrate the reconstruction of metaphorical mapping into a pre-translation analysis, which allows for the preservation of the spirit of the original version. These insights advance interdisciplinary research on poetry interpretation and the practice of translation.

Keywords: conceptual metaphor; metaphorical mapping; poetry; translation; pre-translation analysis

Metaphor has been accepted as one of the key components of poetry since its mention in *Poetics* by Aristotle, who linked literal to figurative meaning. Cognitive linguistics developed this notion. According to G. Lakoff, "poetic metaphors are not in language, but in thought: they are general mappings across conceptual domains" (Lakoff & Turner, 1989). Metaphors involve two domains and metaphorical mapping can be viewed as *target-domain is source-domain*. Still, conceptual metaphor theory is hardly ever used in the translation of poetry. Moreover, conceptual metaphors are often not even recognized as metaphors because they are seen as uncreative or trivial (Cheetham, 2016). Poetic metaphors are mostly viewed as an expressive means of language and very often their translation is a result of the random choice of possible equivalents from the target language. Consequently, this approach does not take into consideration implicit meanings of metaphors and translations focused on an expressive function of metaphor tend to distort the poet's message. E. A. Nida notes that "instead of going directly from one set of surface structures to another, the competent translator actually goes through a seemingly roundabout process of analysis, transfer, and restructuring" and this step of pre-translation analysis should be the first

one in translation (Nida, 1969). The purpose of this research is to show that analysis of metaphorical mapping in a source language can provide a solid basis for pre-translation analysis of poetic metaphors and their further translation.

This research is guided by the conceptual metaphor theory of G. Lakoff. On the basis of this theory, I propose that the analysis and reconstruction of metaphorical mapping in a source language provide a translator with a reasonable translation strategy which helps to create an adequate translation in the target language. This article intends to show how metaphorical mapping determines a translator's choices of strategies and allows them to remain faithful to the spirit of the original version and the poet's vision in a translated version. I believe that the adequate translation of metaphors ensures the transmission of the poet's vision for metaphors, reflecting "concepts, attitudes, mentalities and ideologies on the part of the writer" (Said Ghazala, 2012). Within this research I study the conceptual metaphors used in the book of poems *Babylon in a Jar* (1998) by Andrew Hudgins. Andrew Hudgins is a contemporary American poet and a professor at Ohio State University. It may be argued that he continues the tradition started by Emily Dickinson and Walt Whitman, as his images and metaphors are derived from ordinary events and things such as gardening, meetings with friends and students and problems in family life. By using everyday routine as a source domain, the poet creates conceptual metaphors revealing his understanding of God, love, death and human nature. This book has never before been translated into Russian.

In this study, I firstly find key conceptual metaphors used in the book of poetry, *Babylon in a Jar*. Secondly, I analyse metaphorical or cross-domain mapping and find similarities, according to which entities in the domain of abstract notion (love, death, human nature, etc.) correspond to entities in the domain of particular phenomenon described in poetic texts (plants, insects, garden, etc.). Thirdly, I outline translation strategies and show that they comply not only with language units, but also with the metaphorical mapping in the original version. On the basis of this analysis I draw a conclusion about the effectiveness of metaphorical mapping as an instrument of pre-translation analysis.

1 The Potential of Conceptual Metaphor in Literary Translation

Conceptual metaphor has already become a powerful tool for analysing correlations between language and mind. The use of metaphors is necessitated by a desire "to associate and to identify the human mind with what goes on outside it" (Donoghue, 2014). D. Donoghue emphasizes that metaphors help people to escape reality and to create a new one. He also cites W. Stevens, who wrote in one of his notes on poetry that "reality is a cliché from which we escape by metaphor" (Stevens, 1951). I. A. Richards points out that art is the medium for the transfer of an experience from one mind to another (West, 2007). Metaphors can help to decode an author's message in such complicated types of discourse as mystical texts and poetry because, according to S. Jaber, I. Ho-Abdullah and R. Vengadasamy, mystical language uses generic-level metaphors and it is possible to decode mystical concepts because they are also products of the human mind (Jaber et al., 2016). Conceptual metaphor theory can be used successfully for the systematic analysis of complicated literary images and their new profound understanding, as, for example, in J. L. Christiansen's study of "the Koranic darknesses" (Christiansen, 2015).

G. Massey refers to the translation of metaphorical mapping into a target language as re-mapping and points out that the explicit investigation of conceptual metaphor in translation is a recent phenomenon (Massey & Ehrensberger-Dow, 2017). He also proposes that reducing the range of potential variables influencing participants' decisions for the results to be interpreted meaningfully remains an unsolved problem. On the one hand, this problem exists because metaphor is typically viewed as being characteristic of language alone, a matter of words rather than thought or action (Burmakova & Marugina, 2014). On the other hand, the task of a translation theory is not to prescribe how metaphors should be translated but rather to describe and explain an identified solution (Burmakova & Marugina, 2014). This is why there are few research papers

outlining strategies for the translation of metaphors. Contemporary researchers (S. Jaber, I. Ho-Abdullah and R. Vengadasamy, G. Massey, M. Ehrensberger-Dow, E. Burmakova, N. Marugina) mostly describe translation procedures.

R. Guldin investigates the relationship of metaphor and translation, in particular the translatability of metaphor. He claims a lack of interest in the new theoretical developments in the field of metaphor studies and their applicability to the translation of metaphors and suggests that translation is broader than the transfer of meaning from one language to another (Guldin, 2016). N. Dobric also points out that “the translation of metaphors should firstly be approached from a cognitive perspective, trying to find appropriate conceptual equivalence” (Dobric, 2011). He suggests three schemes correlating with possible strategies of translation: 1. Same Mapping Structure (SMS); 2. Comparable Mapping Structure (CMS); and 3. Different Mapping Structure (DMS). These schemes reflect the similarity or diversity of metaphorical mapping in source and target languages, which helps the translator choose a strategy: either to look for a cognitive equivalent or turn to other translational tools.

Some metaphorical expressions are familiar to most people and are even lexicalized (Wassell & Llewelyn, 2014). In this case, translation strategies can be chosen easily. G. Steen created the first large-scale method for linguistic metaphor identification. This scheme includes five steps (Steen, 2009). Step 1 identifies metaphor-related words. Step 2 transforms them into conceptual structures (a series of propositions). Step 3 transforms the single proposition into an open comparison between two incomplete propositions. Step 4 makes an analogy of this comparison. Step 5 reveals a mapping structure.

This scheme can be applied to various types of discourse, including fiction. For example, J. Ostanina-Olszewska and K. S. Despot use MIPVU (Metaphor Identification Procedure VU University Amsterdam) to identify linguistic metaphors in Russian, Polish, Croatian and English and to analyse the metaphorical conceptions of translation equivalents in these languages (Ostanina-Olszewska & Despot, 2017). Though G. Steen does not suggest that this scheme can be applied to poetry translations, I believe that it can be developed further in order to be applied to poetry translations at the stage of pre-translation analysis, together with the scheme outlined by N. Dobric.

On the basis of the literature review the following is assumed: Firstly, conceptual metaphor plays a crucial role in transmitting a poet’s message to the reader and that is why it cannot be omitted in a target language while translating; secondly, the methodology of the translation of conceptual metaphor has not been outlined because the existing research mostly describes translators’ decisions and not strategies by which they are guided; thirdly, a translation strategy can be created on the basis of the reconstruction of metaphorical mapping in a target text. In relation to this, G. Steen’s scheme can be used as a tool for the analysis of metaphorical mapping in a source text and its recreation in a target text.

2 Conceptual Metaphor as the Key to Translation of Poetry by Andrew Hudgins

Key conceptual metaphors are listed in the Master Metaphor List by G. Lakoff (Lakoff et al., 1989). The search for the key conceptual metaphors in the book *Babylon in a Jar* was guided by this list. The key conceptual metaphors in the poetry book are *plants are people*, *purposeful action is directed motion to a destination*, *lack of purpose is lack of direction*, *people are buildings*, *death is departure*, *emotional intimacy is physical closeness (love is a unity)*, *life is a journey*. The search also found metaphors appealing to the Bible, which are not listed by G. Lakoff: *resurrection is a new life*, *people are dust*, and *Heaven is a garden*.

In order to analyse metaphorical mapping, a scheme outlined by G. Steen was used. *Plants are people* is a conceptual metaphor frequently used by A. Hudgins in the book. For example, in the poem “The Chinaberry”, metaphor-related words are “...they (grackles) held the tree’s shape \ the

black tree \ peeling from the green, \ as if \ they were its shadow or its soul...” Literally, grackles are the chinaberry’s soul. The chinaberry has soul and the character has soul, but the tree and a human being are not openly compared. Step 2 makes this proposition explicit. Grackles shape the tree: they hold it and leave it, and the reader realizes that the poem is not about the grackles’ departure. Instead, it is about the death of something inside a human-being. Step 3 compares two incomplete propositions. At the end of the poem the poet characterizes the tree as abandoned. The following analogy is identified according to step 4 of G. Steen’s scheme: not only is the tree abandoned, but the character also feels empty, though it is not said explicitly. It is also possible to assume that a frustrated person is an abandoned tree. Finally, the conceptual metaphor *plants are people* is elicited. This is step 5.

Table 1. The Original Version of “The Chinaberry” by A. Hudgins and the Author’s Translation into Russian.

Original version	Translation
THE CHINABERRY	ЯБЛОНЯ
I couldn't stand still watching them forever, but when I moved	Я не мог стоять вечно, глядя на птиц. Но когда я шагнул,
the grackles covering each branch and twig	скворцы, облепившие ветви, взвились
sprang	в воздух
together into flight	единой стаей.
and for a moment in midair they held the tree's shape,	На миг они повторили контур дерева,
the black tree	черная крона
peeling from the green,	оторвалась от зеленой,
as if	будто
they were its shadow or its soul, before they scattered,	птицы – тень дерева или душа. Затем рассеялись,
circled and	кружась
re-formed	и собираясь вновь.
as grackles heading south for winter grain fields. Oh, it	Скворцы улетают на юг, к озымым полям. Всего лишь
was just a chinaberry tree, the birds were simply grackles.	яблоня в моем саду, и неприметные скворцы.
A miracle	Чудо,
Made from this world and where I stood in it. But you can't know how long	Явленное миру и мне, стоявшему здесь. Но ты не видел, как долго
I stood there	я стоял
watching.	и наблюдал.
And you can't know how desperate I'd become advancing	Но ты не видел, как в отчаянии я брел
each step on the feet of my advancing shadow,	шаг в шаг с моей повсюду первой тенью,
how bitter and afraid I was	как я в тоске и страхе
matching step after step with the underworld my ominous, indistinct and mirror image darkening with	ступал след в след в сырую землю с моим зловещим, искаженным двойником, он затмевал
extreme and antic nothings	нелепой и огромной кляксой
the ground I walked on,	мой путь,
inexact reversals,	он колебался,
elongated and foreshortened parodies of each	тянулся и сжимался как в насмешку, когда
foot lowering itself	я наступал
onto its shadow.	ему на пятки.
And you can't know how I had tried to force the moment, make it happen	И ты не знал, как я пытался миг приблизить, заставить раньше

before it happened –	времени прийти,
not necessarily this	не обязательно тот самый,
though this is what I saw:	но вот что я увидел:
black birds deserting the tree they had become,	черные птицы покинули дерево, которым стали,
becoming,	превратились
for a moment in midair,	на миг в его тень,
the chinaberry's shadow for a moment	стали на миг тенью яблони,
after they had ceased to be	когда перестали быть
the chinaberry,	яблоней,
then scattering:	после рассеялись –
meaning after meaning –	смысл за смыслом –
birds strewn across the morning like flung gravel	птицы порхнули сквозь утро словно гравий из-под колес
until	и снова
they found themselves again as grackles,	стали скворцами,
found each other,	нашли друг друга,
found South	дорогу на юг
and headed there,	и туда устремились,
while I stood before	пока я предстоял покинутой,
the green, abandoned tree.	в листьях еще яблоне.

All the steps are connected with one another. To reconstruct metaphorical mapping in a target language, one needs to go through the same steps, but this time the purpose is not to find the conceptual metaphor but to ensure that there is the same metaphorical mapping at the core of the translated version. I chose an equivalent for the translation of metaphor-related expressions, bearing in mind the results obtained at steps 2, 3, 4 and 5. The word choice in a translated version should allow the recreation of the same metaphorical mapping in the target language. In “The Chinaberry”, the title is the most challenging element for a translator. This tree is not typical of the Russian landscape and the use of word-for-word translation is not desirable because both possible variants sound disharmonious. The first variant is “мелия атседарах” [melia atsedarakh]. It includes two words and the first one sounds like “shallows” in Russian, which generates inappropriate associations. The second variant is “клокочина” [klokochina] and the root of the word generates an association with the verb “to gurgle”, which in Russian is used either to describe water movement or deep anger. Consequently, it was necessary to find an appropriate substitution for the tree.

According to Dobric’s scheme, the title of the poem is a case of Comparable Mapping Structure, with the same conceptual content and different lexicalizations. In Western countries, the chinaberry tree is believed to be symbolic of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil in the Garden of Eden. It may also symbolize hope and strength (Lupton, 1984) and send the reader back to J. R. Fauset’s novel, which was first published in 1931 (Fauset, 2013). I believe that it is possible for the poet to have had in mind the notions both of the Tree of Knowledge and of hope because in another poem from the book he says explicitly that the character’s garden is Heaven. At the same time, hope for reunion is expressed in this poem in the following line: “they found themselves again as grackles”. I suppose that the character hopes to find peace in his soul in spite of his abundance or, literally, pieces of his soul will be put together as the birds. I realize that the reader can hardly recognize the possible allusion to the novel *The Chinaberry Tree* by J. R. Fauset because it has not been translated into Russian. In Russia, the apple tree is associated with the Tree of Knowledge. For this reason, I find it a proper equivalent which does not contradict the reconstructed metaphorical mapping. I realize that this strategy can be viewed as domestication, which deprives readers of the chance to familiarize themselves with American realia. However, cultural losses in this case are compensated by achieving translation adequacy because the other elements of cognitive structure are not distorted and the translation strategy is supported by the reconstruction of metaphorical mapping.

It has been shown how metaphorical mapping was reconstructed in the poem “The Chinaberry”. Grackles that are the soul of the tree leave the tree. This is why another conceptual metaphor

in the poem, *death is departure*, is identified. The poet gives us a hint in these lines: “And you can’t know how desperate I’d become \ advancing \ each step on the feet of my \ advancing shadow, \ how bitter and afraid I was \ matching step after step with the underworld”. The soul of the tree moves upwards while the character’s soul moves downwards. In Russian there are many equivalents for ‘the underworld’ but most of them lack this focus on ‘under’. While choosing the most suitable equivalent, I took into account that it should not add any shadows of meaning to the combination of conceptual metaphors in the poem. The variant chosen is ‘сырая земля’ (moist ground) because it is a typical notion for ‘grave’ in Russian culture. This equivalent supports the juxtaposition between Heaven (sky) and underworld (ground).

The conceptual metaphor *plants are people* is also found in several other poems in the anthology: “After Muscling through Sharp Greenery”, “Poem”, “Wind”, “The Daffodils Erupt in Clumps”, “Heaven”, and “Elegy for the Bees”. This metaphor is always accompanied by other conceptual metaphors: *resurrection is coming back*, *death is departure*, *emotional intimacy is physical closeness*. These combinations reflect the individual vision of the poet. The decoding of these combinations represents an additional translation challenge.

In the poems “The Daffodils Erupt in Clumps” and “Elegy for the Bees”, the target domain for the metaphor *plants are people* is a flower. In the first poem it is a daffodil which also symbolizes youth and spring in Western cultures. The beginning of this poem is similar to the beginning of another poem titled “Poem” (“The daffodil erupt in clumps”, “Blunt daffodil spikes...split frozen earth”). In “Poem”, the focus is on the life cycle of the daffodil. It dies and resurrects to serve others (“But watch \ bees drink from their crimped lips”). Taking into consideration the complicated interconnections between these poems, I tried to recreate cognitive mapping for the poem “The Daffodils Erupt in Clumps”. In this poem, metaphor-related expressions are “lift a block of dirt \ above their heads”, “unfurl their yellow fripperies”. The daffodil is described in a less sublime manner as in “Poem”. Step 2 transforms these expressions into conceptual structure: daffodils are like beautiful women, like Agrippina, who was pretty and vicious. Step 3 compares two incomplete propositions: possessing flowers is like possessing a woman. Step 4 makes an analogy of this comparison: not only does the character snip flowers for the table, but he kills living creatures. Step 5 reveals a mapping structure: *plants are people*.

Relationships with pollinators are described in this poem and play a crucial role for interpreting the poem. I will describe the process of metaphorical mapping according to G. Steen’s scheme for the metaphor *emotional intimacy is physical closeness*. It is a subtype of the conceptual metaphor *love is a union*. Step 1: metaphor-related expressions are “honeybee and bumblebee and even moth \ ransack and rummage them”. Step 2: the conceptual structure is pollinators’ interaction with flowers. Step 3: the interaction of pollinators and flowers is like sexual intercourse. Step 4: the character kills his lover and destroys the love union. Finding this proposition and making it explicit clarifies the role of the character in this poem. He snips flowers for the table and compares this deed with Nero’s assassination of his mother. This comparison can be fully understood only after a careful analysis of metaphorical mapping.

Bearing in mind this analysis, a translator must overcome the following challenges: not to describe the daffodils as modest flowers (they are pretty women with fripperies) and not to smooth the description of dead Agrippina (the focus on Nero’s cold cruelty and aesthetic perception of his mother’s corpse should be kept). The original poem and the translated version in Russian are presented in Table 2.

According to the analysis of cognitive mapping in the frame of pre-translation analysis, the following equivalents were chosen: yellow fripperies – *игривые венцы*, mere loveliness – *красивая безделица*, ransack and rummage them – *жадно мнут*. All these expressions were not chosen randomly, but in order to recreate the key features of the original version: to show the attractive and coquettish image of the flowers and the passionate relationship between them and pollinators. To show explicitly Nero’s cruelty, I used the word “*матушка*”, which has a cynical undertone of meaning in this context.

Table 2. The Original Version of “The Daffodils Erupt in Clumps” by A. Hudgins and the Author’s Translation into Russian.

Original version	Translation
THE DAFFODILS ERUPT IN CLUMPS	НАРЦИССЫ РВУТСЯ ИЗ ЗЕМЛИ
The daffodils erupt in clumps so thick they	Нарциссы рвутся из земли, тяжелый
lift a block of dirt above their heads, raising	грязный ком свергают, вздымают головы
dark soil	из темноты
in exaltation, offering wet earth	с триумфом. Пусть воздух марта
to wet March air. The tight leaves split and sag. The flowerhead bulls up-	напьется этой влагой. Тугие листья врозь. Соцветия вверх,
ward, tilts the lifted earth. Hard, cold rain	отбросив почву. Холодный ливень
bangs the remnant back, back through tall stalks, earth	следы смывает по стеблю вниз, земля
to earth, where it	к земле, откуда
belongs, and flowerheads unfurl their yellow fripperies, which to us	взят, и головы цветов украсили игривые венцы, для нас
are mere loveliness, though they have work to do, and do it: honeybee and bumblebee and even moth ransack and rummage them.	красивая безделица, хотя у них свое предназначение. Шмели и пчелы, даже мотыльки их жадно мнут.
But beauty	Но красота,
unfurled for one eye catches many, and I	открывшись одному, влечет и прочих. Я
snip flowers for the table, where, sipping wine like Nero,	цветы срезаю, чтоб на стол поставить и славное потягивать вино,
pensive,	задумчиво
I'll study them as Nero studied the corpse of Agrippina,	на них смотреть, как некогда Нерон на тело Агриппины,
handling	касаясь
the suddenly compliant limbs, admiring	столь податливых кистей, одна рука
one arm, faulting	прекрасна, другую
one.	чуть поправил.
“I hadn't known,” he said,	«Я и не знал», – он произнес, –
“I hadn't known my mother was so beautiful.”	«Я и не думал, что матушка была так хороша».

In the poem “Elegy for the Bees”, there are the same conceptual metaphors, *plants are people* and *emotional intimacy is physical closeness*, but the poet depicts a garden without pollinators (“the fruit unformed and therefore never swollen, \ not green, not ripe, not plucked and eaten”). The character in this case tries to solve this problem (“a human bumble in the void”). Obviously, this poem is not only about gardening and the urgent ecological problem of the potential extinction of bees. It is about loneliness and a lack of love, as both physical closeness and emotional intimacy affecting a human-being’s existence. When this idea is decoded, the metaphor-related expressions about the unformed fruit sound much more tragic and demand an appropriate treatment while being translated. Reconstruction of this metaphorical mapping is the key to translation, for example, of the following metaphor-related expressions “a human bumbler in the void”, and “draped with pollen \ like yellow pantaloons, like golden saddlebags”, because it helps a translator to keep focused on the idea of the character’s loneliness and lack of physical closeness.

One of the Biblical metaphors used in the book is *people are dust*. In the poem “Ashes”, the poet describes how he had to throw away the ashes of a dead woman because the dead should not be treated as the living. The poet expresses this idea explicitly: “almost all \ the dead – even those \ we loved \ loved utterly \ because they are sheer dust \ and should be honoured as the dust they are”. These lines match the citation from the Bible: “By the sweat of your face you shall eat bread, till you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; for you are dust, and to dust you shall return” (Genesis 3:19). There is the same metaphor in the poem “One Threw a Dirt Clod and It Ran”, but the target domain is missing. B. Wassell and S. Llewelyn note that Biblical metaphors are often lexicalized (Wassell & Llewelyn, 2014). Consequently, this underlying conceptual metaphor is familiar to the Russian reader and its meaning is mediated through the language and culture. In the poem, children throw a dirt clod and follow it. Towards the end of the poem the reader stops, realizing that the clod is not a living human-being: “They nudged the huge corpse and waited for it to rise”. The author only describes the game, and the reader does not realize the cruelty of the children. For a translator the metaphor *people are dust* here is a guide to an adequate conveying of the emotional impact of the original.

As the above-mentioned example shows, A. Hudgins often derives profound and complicated imagery from trivial things. The poem “We Were Simply Talking” is not an exception. With the help of G. Steen’s scheme, I analysed the metaphorical mapping in this poem. Firstly, I singled out metaphor-related words. They depict a traffic accident: “the car slid / and I corrected, fishtailed and I corrected”. Secondly, I identified conceptual structures: a car trip which ends in a frozen ditch. Thirdly, I realized that this car trip is compared to a human’s life. Fourthly, I made an analogy: a person’s life can be over as suddenly as an ordinary car trip. Finally, the mapping structure *life is a journey* is revealed.

Table 3. The Original Version of “We Were Simply Talking” by A. Hudgins and the Author’s Translation into Russian.

Original version	Translation
WE WERE SIMPLY TALKING	МЫ ПРОСТО БОЛТАЛИ
We were simply talking, probably work, or relatives or even Christmas presents, when the car slid and I corrected, fishtailed and I corrected, then we were gone, sliding sideways, sliding backward on black ice	Мы просто болтали, наверно, о родственниках, о делах, о подарках на Рождество, когда машина вильнула, я выровнял, ее занесло, выровнял, и нас потащило, мы скользили в сторону, скользили вперед по черному льду,
and staring into the grill of a diesel tractor, also sliding, and in that instant I was ready to die.	упираясь в решетку трактора, который тоже скользил, и в тот миг я был готов умереть.
I saw my wife and was overjoyed that I had married her, though our marriage was already falling apart, and I loved the car, a brown Toyota, loved being warm in the car while it was white, cold, bitter out in the world we’d lost control of. I loved every molecule of breath I wasn’t taking, and for the moment I forgave myself every sin and failure of my life, including this ridiculous and undignified early death.	Я смотрел на жену и был счастлив, что мы поженились, хотя наш брак уже разваливался потихоньку, я любил эту машину, коричневую тойоту, любил когда в ней тепло, а вокруг белый, холодный и грустный мир, над которым мы потеряли контроль. Любил каждую молекулу воздуха, которую не вдохнул, на мгновение я простил себе все грехи, все жалкие неудачи, включая эту нелепую и постыдную раннюю смерть.
The car snapped backward into a frozen ditch.	Машина свалилась в замерзшую яму.
I sat speechless, shaking, my wife speechless also, and a man pulled up, a salesman: You folks okay?	Я сидел молча и трясся, жена тоже молчала, нас вытащил парень из магазина: Вы ребята в порядке?
Suddenly the radio roared, and by the car a dog barked wildly and, yes, we were fine.	Вдруг радио заорало, и где-то залаял неистово пес, и да, мы были в порядке.
Fine. We were fine. But what was “fine,” I wondered,	В порядке. В порядке. Что вообще такое «порядок», я спрашиваю,
and why do we always, always have to speak?	и почему мы всегда, всегда должны говорить?

The word “fine” is repeated at the end of the poem 4 times. Moreover, the end of the poem is “the strong position” where the emotional and aesthetic effects are accumulated (Arnol’d, 1978). That is why I could not neglect thorough pre-translation analysis in order to find an appropriate translation variant for this word and phrases including it. In the translation above, the revealing of the metaphorical mapping helped me to choose the translation variant for these succinct lines. The Russian phrase “в порядке” (literally, in order) is used in everyday situations as the equivalent of “I am fine” in English. However, the word “порядок” (order) reminds the reader about the world order controlling one’s life and determining how much time one has left. This choice of a translation variant also relates to the key conceptual metaphor of this poem, *life is a journey*.

3 Conclusion

In this essay I have identified the key conceptual metaphors in the book of poems *Babylon in a Jar*, analysed the metaphorical mapping in selected poems from the book, and outlined translation strategies for the most challenging elements of these poems. Analysis of metaphorical mapping according to G. Steen’s scheme is used as a guide for outlining translation strategies for the first time. Reconstruction of metaphorical mapping allowed me to overcome translation challenges of different types: firstly, the translation of culturally specific units; secondly, the translation of metaphor-related expressions; thirdly, the decoding of the author’s complicated ideas and implicit messages.

The research shows that the reconstruction of metaphorical mapping can be used as an instrument of a pre-translation analysis of poetry. This instrument helps translators to interpret a poet’s worldview in depth and to choose appropriate translation strategies for his/her poems. The research opens the way for further studies demonstrating how this instrument works in the pre-translation analysis of poetry by other authors and for other types of discourse, such as prose fiction.


References

- Arnol’d, I. V. (1978). Znachenie sil’noĭ pozitsii dlia interpretatsii khudozhestvennogo teksta. *Inostrannye iazyki v shkole / Foreign Languages at School*, 1978(4), 6–13.
- Burmakova, E. A., & Marugina, N. I. (2014). Cognitive approach to metaphor translation in literary discourse. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 154, 527–533. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.10.180>
- Cheetham, D. (2016). Literary translation and conceptual metaphors: From movement to performance. *Translation Studies*, 9(3), 241–255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14781700.2016.1180543>
- Christiansen, J. L. (2015). The dark Koran: A semantic analysis of the Koranic darknesses (*ẓulumāt*) and their metaphorical usage. *Arabica*, 62(2–3), 185–233. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15700585-12341352>
- Dobric, N. (2011). The cognitive approach to translating metaphors revisited: The case of *pure*, *clear* and *clean* vs. *čist* and *jasan*. *AAA: Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik*, 36(2), 99–116.
- Donoghue, D. (2014). The motive for metaphor. In D. Donoghue, *Metaphor* (pp. 182–210). Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674419483.c6>
- Fauset, J. R. (2013). *The chinaberry tree: A novel of American life*. Dover Publications.
- Guldin, R. (2016). *Translation as metaphor*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315753638-3>
- Jaberi, S., Ho-Abdullah, I., & Vengadasamy, R. (2016). Mystical love metaphors: A cognitive analysis of Sohrab Sepehri’s poetry. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 16(1), 143–156.
- Lakoff, G., Espenson, J., & Goldberg, A. (1989). *Master metaphor list*. University of California at Berkeley.
- Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989). *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor*. University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226470986.001.0001>
- Lupton, M. J. (1984). Bad blood in Jersey: Jessie Fauset’s *The chinaberry tree*. *CLA Journal*, 27(4), 383–392.

- Massey, G., & Ehrensberger-Dow, M. (2017). Translating conceptual metaphor: The processes of managing interlingual asymmetry. *Research in Language*, 15(2), 173–189. <https://doi.org/10.1515/re1a-2017-0011>
- Nida, E. A. (1969). Science of translation. *Language*, 45(3), 483–498. <https://doi.org/10.2307/411434>
- Ostanina-Olszewska, J., & Despot, K. S. (2017). When *soul* is lost in translation: Metaphorical conceptions of soul in Dostoyevsky's original *Brat'ia Karamazovy* (*The Brothers Karamazov*) and its translations into Polish, Croatian and English. *Cognitive Studies / Études cognitives*, 2017(17), Article 1319. <https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.1319>
- Said Ghazala, H. (2012). Translating the metaphor: A cognitive stylistic conceptualization (English – Arabic). *World Journal of English Language*, 2(4), 57–68. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v2n4p57>
- Steen, G. (2009). From linguistic form to conceptual structure in five steps: Analyzing metaphor in poetry. In G. Brône & J. Vandaele (Eds.), *Cognitive poetics: Goals, gains and gaps* (pp. 197–226). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Stevens, W. (1951). *The necessary angel: Essays on reality and the imagination*. Vintage Books.
- Wassell, B. E., & Llewelyn, S. R. (2014). “Fishers of humans,” the contemporary theory of metaphor, and conceptual blending theory. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 133(3), 627–646. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jbl.2014.0030>
- West, D. (2007). A. Richards' theory of metaphor: Between protocognitivism and poststructuralism. In L. Jeffries, D. McIntyre, & D. Bousfield (Eds.), *Stylistics and social cognition* (pp. 1–18). Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789401200646_002

The publication was financed at the author's expense.

The author declares that she has no competing interests.

 This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 PL License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/pl/>), which permits redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, provided that the article is properly cited.

© The Author 2022

Publisher: Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences

Publishing history: Received 2022-02-17; Accepted 2022-05-03; Published 2022-12-28.